

## **REMARKS**

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4 and 6-20 remain unamended. In addition, claims 2, 3 and 5 remain cancelled.

Claims 1, 4 and 6-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Motamed et al. (U.S. 7,081,969), Stephens et al. (U.S. 2003/0095524) and Salgado et al. (U.S. 2002/0067504). These rejections are respectfully traversed and are believed clearly inapplicable to claims 1, 4 and 6-20 for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites an apparatus including (1) a service-specific information acquisition section for acquiring service-specific information containing information related to an application that is operable on each of the electronic apparatuses which implement the service and is used for implementing the service. In addition the apparatus of claim 1 includes (2) a storage section for storing at least one piece of service-specific information acquired by the service-specific information acquisition section. Moreover, the apparatus of claim 1 includes (3) an apparatus-specific information acquisition section for acquiring apparatus-specific information related to each electronic apparatus of the system. Further, the apparatus of claim 1 includes (4) a search section for searching for a service which can be implemented by the electronic apparatuses of the system, the searching being based on the service-specific information (information that is related to an application that is operable on each of the electronic apparatuses which implement the service and is used for implementing the service) stored in the storage section and the apparatus-specific information acquired by the apparatus-specific information acquisition section.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Motamed for disclosing above-mentioned distinguishing features (1)-(4), as recited in claim 1. However, Motamed fails to disclose or suggest distinguishing features (1)-(4).

Rather, Motamed merely teaches that a user can select an AutoSearch tab 32 which starts a search across a local network to find available printers (see col. 2, lines 57-60) and teaches that the user can alternatively search for printers by selecting IP addresses that fall within a range (see col. 2, lines 60-63).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Motamed teaches that a user can search for printers based on availability or based on IP addresses, but fails to disclose or suggest a search section for searching for a service which can be implemented by the electronic apparatuses, as recited in claim 1.

In addition, it is evident that, although Motamed discloses searching based on availability or IP addresses, Motamed still fails to disclose or suggest searching based on the service-specific information (information that is related to an application that is operable on each of the electronic apparatuses which implement the service and is used for implementing the service) stored in the storage section and the apparatus-specific information, as required by claim 1.

It is also noted that Motamed also teaches print load balancing, which routes print jobs to a printer based on factors such as printing page per minute rates, the number of pages in a job, and a number of copies (see col. 3, lines 44-col. 4, line 24). However, although Motamed teaches that print jobs can be routed based on various factors, Motamed still fails to disclose or suggest searching for a service to be implemented by the electronic apparatuses, the searching being based on the service-specific information (information that is related to an application that

is operable on each of the electronic apparatuses which implement the service and is used for implementing the service) stored in the storage section and the apparatus-specific information, as required by claim 1.

In addition, it is noted that the structure required by claim 1 allows a user to easily search for services which can be implemented by a combination of various electronic apparatuses, thus reducing a number of accesses to a server for downloading applications and reducing a communication load on a network. However, Motamed merely provides a system of searching for printers that are available. Thus, it is clear that Motamed cannot provide the benefit of the structure required by claim 1.

Independent claim 1 also recites that the apparatus includes (5) an update notification section for notifying the electronic apparatuses of the system that an updated version of the application (operable on each of the electronic apparatuses which implement the service), exists, if the stored service-specific information includes information related to the application that, based on the search result, indicates that an updated version of the application is available.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Motamed and Stephens fail to disclose or suggest distinguishing feature (5), as recited in claim 1. In light of the above this rejection relies on Salgado for teaching the above-mentioned features which are lacking from Motamed and Stephens.

However, Salgado merely teaches that a driver itself queries whether the user wants to download and install a newer version of the driver once a newer version is found, and teaches that a driver can simply notify a user that a new driver has been downloaded and installed (see paragraphs [0011] and [0024]).

In view of the above, it is evident that Salgado teaches notifying a user of a printer if an updated printer driver is available or has been downloaded, but still fails to disclose or suggest notifying the electronic apparatuses of the system that an updated version of the application (that is operable on each of the electronic apparatuses which **together** implement the service) exists, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, it is also apparent that Salgado teaches that only the user of the printer is notified of an updated driver, but fails to disclose or suggest notifying the electronic apparatuses of the system that an updated version exists, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 4 and 6-19 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Motamed, Stephens and Salgado.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Motamed, Stephens and Salgado or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Motamed, Stephens and/or Salgado to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 4 and 6-19 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 20 is directed to a method, and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is allowable over Motamed, Stephens and Salgado.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The

Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Takahiro WATANABE et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2008.09.18 16:50:07 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap

Registration No. 60,554

Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led

Washington, D.C. 20006-1021

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

September 18, 2008